A VINDICATION OF THE LETTER out of the North,

Concerning Bishop *LAKE*'s Declaration of his dying in the Belief of the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, &c.

In Answer to a late PAMPHLET, called, *The Defence of the Profession*, &c. *of the said Bishop.*

As far as it concerns the Person of Quality.

LICENS'D,

Jan. 27. 16$\frac{8}{9}$0.

LONDON;
Printed for *Awnsham Churchill*, at the Sign of the *Black Swan*, near *Amen-Corner*. 1690.

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

LETTER out of the *North*, &c.

DEAR SIR,

I Deferred my Thanks for your Laſt, till I could tell you I had received the little Pamphlet, wherein you thought I had ſome concern, therefore if this appear a ſlow Return to yours, you are to blame the Carrier's pace, which was not like to mend in ſo bad Weather and Ways. But this is to own that I yeſterday received it; and being at preſent from my own Houſe, and wanting the convenience of my Books and Papers here, I thought it better to give you an account of thoſe things which a firſt and ſecond Reading ſuggeſted, than to take a longer time to conſider of it, and thereby raiſe your Expectations beyond what I can come up to. But beſides, the Letter you ſent me being both without Date and Licence, I know not how long I may have been in this worthy Author's Debt, and therefore make all the haſte I can to get out of it. For altho I did not intend to have troubled either him or the World with any more of my Pamphlets, yet the Reſpect that he is pleaſed to ſhew to my *Quality*, is ſo particular and obliging, that I was afraid I ſhould have diſparaged my Breeding, if I had not made my Acknowledgments for it. I might indeed have returned his Complement, and begg'd your Pardon for giving you a trouble for which there is ſo little occaſion; for I believe there are ſome that think his Letter does as little need an

Anſwer as mine did. But I'le aſſure you I am very ſenſible of his Favour in taking notice of ſuch a Trifle, when ſo many learned and weighty Treatiſes lie by him unanſwered; therefore ſhall not ſuppoſe he pick'd mine out becauſe it was the weakeſt, but becauſe there was ſomething in it that deſerved an Anſwer. But yet I muſt not be ſo vain as to aſſume all the good Language in the Book to my ſelf; for, to ſpeak the Truth, he has pretty equally diſpenced his Favours between three of us; but mine being the largeſt Part, I ſhall leave the other two to anſwer for themſelves, while I admire the Author's dexterity in knocking down three at one blow; I have indeed heard of killing two Birds with one ſtone before, but three at a time, beſides routing a whole Party, is ſo extraordinary, that I begin to fear Bombs will come in faſhion in this kind of War alſo, for one ſingle Bullet could never have made ſuch Deſtruction: But if there be ſuch Execution by the by, alas, what will become of me, againſt whom the murderous Engine was directly levelled? But you will ſuppoſe that I have a little too much buſineſs on my hands to make a long Preamble, therefore ſhall proceed to the Letter, and take it as it riſes.

And in the firſt place, he preſents us with a ſhort, and ſo very ſhort an Account of the good Biſhop's Life, from his Cradle to his laſt Sickneſs, that I have nothing to except againſt it, but that it is no longer; and to beg leave to in-
Page 4. form the Author a little better in one Paſſage of it, which I muſt confeſs I did a little wonder to ſee inſiſted on, becauſe that of his expoſing himſelf to the Rabble was not by his Friends look'd on as the moſt prudent Act of his Life. But the Truth as well as the Short of the Story, is this: They have for a long time at *York* had a Cuſtom (which now challenges the Priviledg of a Preſcription) that all the Apprentices, Journy-men, and other Servants of the Town, had the liberty to go into the Cathedral, and ring the Pancake-Bell (as we call it in the Country) on *Shrove-Tueſday*; and that being a time that a great many came out of the Country to ſee the City, (if not their Friends) and Church; to oblige the ordinary People, the Minſter uſed to be left open that day, to let them go up to ſee the Lanthorn and Bells, which were ſure to be pretty well exerciſed, and was thought a more

more innocent Divertiſement than being at the Alehouſe. But Dr. *Lake*, when he came firſt to reſide there, was very much ſcandaliz'd at this Cuſtom, and was reſolved he would break it at firſt daſh, altho all his Brethren of the Clergy did diſſwade him from it. For altho they had as much Zeal both for the Honour of God and the Church as he could have, yet being better acquainted with the Temper of the People than he was, they knew it would be a vain, as well as hazardous thing to attempt it: but all their Arguments could not prevail, for he was reſolved to make the Experiment, for which he had like to have paid very dear, for I'le aſſure you 'twas very near coſting him his Life, and others too, that in kindneſs came at firſt to diſſwade *him*, but had much ado to ſecure *themſelves*. But however he did make ſuch a Combuſtion and Mutiny, that I dare ſay *York* never remembred nor ſaw the like, as many yet living can teſtify. But how well ſoever the good Man deſigned in the thing, (as I verily believe he did) yet his Zeal was ſo indiſcreetly managed, that it had like to have produced the worſt of Miſchiefs; and therefore in ſome Peoples Opinion, that were better Judges of the Fact than I was, he did not deſerve any Encomium for it. But however at this time it would not be very reaſonable to follow ſuch an Example, which was all I took notice of it for.

The other memorable Thing he relates, of his entring into *Epiſcopal* Orders in the time of the late Diſtractions, is truly praiſe-worthy, altho he is not the only Man that did it; for I know one that now fills as eminent a Place in the Church as Bp *Lake* ever did, that did the ſame thing, and that under more diſcouraging Circumſtances, for he had not only the Danger of the Times to contend with, but was to reject the Importunity of his Friends alſo, nay more than that, to overcome himſelf, and root out all thoſe Prejudices that a contrary Education (for he was brought up a ſtrict Presbyterian) and Prepoſſeſſion had implanted in him, which were indeed ſuch Difficulties as might have diſcouraged any body but himſelf, but by God's Grace he overcame them all, and is now as uſeful, as eminent in that Church, to which he dedicated himſelf ſix years before K. *Charles* the 2*d*'s Reſtoration. But I do not ſay this to derogate from Bp *Lake*, *Page* 2.

for

for the more Inſtances the better, of ſuch heroick Vertue; therefore could have wiſh'd that our Author had given us a larger Account of that excellent Biſhop, whoſe Life I dare ſay might have furniſhed him with a great many more remarkable Paſſages; however I think there is nothing more that I need inſiſt upon in the firſt Part, for I do not know that I ever queſtioned either the Biſhop's making of the Profeſſion, or the Solemnity of the Circumſtances with which it was done, therefore muſt crave leave to tell my Author, that he has a little miſtaken the Point, for 'twas not the *making*, but the *publiſhing* of it that I excepted againſt: for to another body it would be pretty evident that it was only the publiſhing of it that ſeemed ſo unaccountable to me, although indeed it's a Parentheſis, and only in that, is ſaid, 'That there 'ſeemed no greater occaſion for the making of it, than there 'was for my Lord Archbiſhop to put out Manifeſto's to tell 'the People he is ſuſpended on the ſame account. (for theſe are the very Words of the Letter:) and where the great offence of them lies, or *the angry Objection againſt the making of the Proteſtation*, I muſt confeſs I do not yet ſee. For I hope the putting him in the ſame form with his Grace of *Canterbury*, could be no Affront or Diſparagement; however I dare ſay the good Biſhop would not have thought it ſo. But the Perſon of Quality is upon all occaſions ſo extreamly obliged to this worthy Author, that 'tis all one what I ſay, for even my own Encomiums meet with this Return; for theſe are his Words, 'His Civility and due Re-
Page 13. 'ſpect for the Memory of the late Reverend Biſhop, I ſhould 'with all Thankfulneſs moſt readily acknowledg, if I could 'think it not deſigned, with the better Grace and more Ce-'remony, to caſt a blemiſh upon one of the laſt and moſt ſo-'lemn Acts of his Life. But I wonder how long he and the Perſon of Quality have been ſo intimately acquainted; for although I am ſure he does not know my Face, yet he pretends to know my Heart a great deal better than I do my ſelf, (if the Inferences he is pleaſed to make in this and ſome other Places are true) for I can aſſure you he tells me of Deſigns I never thought on. But ſince he makes ſuch Objections, I hope he will take care to anſwer them, for I thank God I am not at all concerned to do it. But in the mean

time

time he did very well to slip his own Neck out of the Collar; and though he pretends to answer my Letter, yet waves the main Point, which was the Design of *publishing* the Protestation; which he tells us does not at all *concern his Friends, who had no hand in it.* But truly that would hardly be credible, if he did not affirm it; for not many lines before, the Person of Quality is accused for designing to cast a Blemish on the last and most solemn Act of his Life. Upon which, if this be true, it seems his Friends set no very great Value; for methinks 'tis pretty odd that what was signed and asserted so solemnly, should be immediately so exposed, that the Witnesses and Friends, should neither know how, nor why it was made publick; but that was a Query that I believe it was not convenient to answer, and so did very well to start a new Question; and although he will not tell you why the Profession was publish'd (though he knows it as well as most Men in *England*) yet he will tell you as good a thing, and that is, the reason why the Bishop *made* it. But before he can do that, he must have t'other fling at the Person of Quality, in whom he has made such Discoveries, as I dare say, you in so many Years Acquaintance have never made. But Quality indeed, were a very desirable thing, if it would make one more sagacious than other People; but poor I, am like to lose my Gentility, because I am not so quick-sighted, as to see *what is so obvious to Persons of less Rank and Quality, than I would be thought of*; for still he will be divining my Thoughts, but has hitherto been so much out, that I would not advise him to set up for a Fortune-Teller, of all things, unless he can make better Guesses at other Peoples Hands, than he has from my Writing: for although I do extreamly value the Esteem of good Men, yet I never desired either to be, or to be thought a great Man. So that without any Offence, he may believe me a Chimney-Sweeper, or a Cobler, if he pleases.

But now he tells us, *That all Men of Reason, knew that* Page 14. *the Reasons for the Doctrine of* Passive Obedience *could not be contained in so small a Compass, and are not well consistent with the Design of a Profession.* But if the Design of it was to give the World Satisfaction, and that in a Controverted Point, which was no Fundamental of the Faith, nor any way

way essential either to the Being or Well-being of the Church; then I cannot think it would have been superfluous to have subjoined the Reasons that made him of that Opinion, rather than of the other. For there being as many great and good Men too, of the other Side, Bishop *Lake*'s bare Name and Opinion is not of Weight enough to turn the Scales, and so we of the Laity must still remain in Suspence: For we must dissent from some of our *Reverend Fathers in God*, let us take which side we please; and being willing to hear both, should have been very glad to have seen the Bishop's Reasons for his adhering so stifly to that Doctrine. For, with Submission to the *Reverend Author*, what Satisfaction soever it might give the good Bishop in the making, the publishing has not given the World very much, for it only tells us, *That he lived and died in that Opinion:* For really, I cannot yet see any great Weight in that Argument of his having been bred and born in it; Nay, indeed, I think it is no Argument at all; for it being common to all Religions, cannot be a Proof of the Truth of any. And those which do lay any great Weight upon that, I should suspect had but very little to say for that Religion, or Opinion, that must be adhered to only on that account. But to prove the Properness of the Argument, the Author is pleased to cite the saying of St. *Polycarp*, Page 24. 'Who when, at his Martyrdom, he was offered 'his Life if he would revile our Saviour, answered, That 'he had now served him 86 Years, and he never did me, says 'he, any Injury, and how can I blaspheme my King and my 'Saviour? This was (adds my Author) thought so conside-'rable, as to be recorded in Eccleſiastical History, and de-'livered down to Posterity. Though I suppose it can be no 'more imagined that Christians only lived then to 86 Years 'of Age, than that only Men of the Church of *England* 'now are bred and born in their Religion. But what then? for really he would have obliged such a dull Creature as the Person of Quality is mightily, if he would have told him the Inference that he is to make from this extraordinary Comparison: For all that I can make of it is this, In *Polycarp*'s Days, other People besides himself lived to be 86 Years old. *Ergo*, Bishop *Lake*'s being bred and born in the Doctrine

Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, is an undeniable Proof of the Truth of it. And in his next Paragraph he brings another Evidence for the Antiquity of it, that I think is not much short of this, as to the end it was designed for; for he tells us, *The Bishop had lived to hear it affirmed, that* Passive Obedience *was a Doctrine of but* 40 *or* 50 *Years standing.* Page 25. But his Testimony alone being sufficient to confute that Error, it was most proper and requisite for him to aver, that he was educated in that Doctrine, and that it was not only as old as he could remember, who was now 65 Years of Age, but that it was taught him as an ancient Doctrine. *And this, Sir* (says he) *was the way of maintaining the Truth of old, by pleading against Hereticks.* What? by bringing a Youth of 15 Years old (for Bishop *Lake* was no more 50 Years ago) to depose for the Antiquity of a Doctrine, and by the single Instance of his being brought up in it, prove the Universality of it. And if this be such convincing Evidence of his side, and if he would please to give us leave to bring in our Witnesses, 'tis possible we might produce as ancient and authentick Persons, who would tell us another Story. Although truly for my own part, I can easily believe the Doctrine to be of a much ancienter date than fifty Years, and 'tis possible might be taught by some from the Reformation. For there was some reason to cajole *Henry* the Eighth, and so to make him more favourable to them, they might tell him what good Passive Subjects they were like to make; which was a thing he liked very well, and therefore it might be a prevalent Argument with him to encourage them as much as he could; but for all that, I am very far from believing it was the Faith of the whole Clergy, either then, or at any time since; but yet believe it gained more ground since King *Charles*'s Restauration, and was more generally received than ever it was before; but yet for all that, Sir, I am sure that both you and I know some of the eminent Fathers of our Church, who never owned it in that Latitude that Bishop *Lake* and some others preach'd it up at. But after all, the Truth is, no Doctrine ought to be valued for the *Antiquity*, but the *Truth* of it. For at that rate Heathenism might claim the Preference to Christianity, because 'tis certain it had the Precedence of it; but Truth is

Truth, though reveal'd but yesterday, and Error not the less Error (but the more to be avoided) for being of some hundred of Years standing. But for all those weighty Reasons for the Bishop's making this Profession, I cannot say that I yet see any Reason to change my Opinion. For I do still believe that his submitting to a Suspension, was a more convincing Proof of his Opinion, than a thousand Volumns; nay, I will say, than a thousand such Protestations: For I dare appeal to the Author himself, whether if Bishop *Lake* had not submitted to Suspension, he would have believed this or any other Protestation of that Nature that he could have made; so that it still seems very evident to me, that though he made it to please himself, yet there was no Necessity on the Bishop's Account to make it publick; the World being as much satisfied of his Opinion as they could be. But although the Author does not think fit to tell us what were the Designs of publishing it, yet he is pleased to quarrel with the Inferences I make from it, but how justly, you shall see presently: For I thank him, instead of confuting, he has confirm'd my first Inference, so that truly I have no Reason to be offended, although he says he has now found out the Cause why I am so. But at this time the Person of Quality is not a *Community*, but speaks only for himself in his private Capacity; so that I dare not undertake for others, to whom perhaps he has given Provocation enough: but they being to be Judges in that Matter, I have nothing more to say to that, only to observe, that instead of denying what I charged the Profession with, the cutting off the Clergy in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Days, he does now absolutely cut off the greatest part of our Clergy now, that is, I am sure the major part of the Bishops of this Kingdom, from being true Sons of the Church of *England*; for which, if you please, you may read his own Words; where repeating my first Inference, which was to suppose that the Protestation did insinuate that from the beginning of the Reformation, ever since the Church of *England* was restored to its Purity, *Passive Obedience* was the Corner-stone of it, for 'tis call'd (though he omits that Clause, which perhaps is the Reason he does not understand the Epithite) the distinguishing

Page 25.

Cha-

Character of the Church of *England*. To which he replies, "That whatever my meaning may be in calling it the "*Corner-Stone*, he must tell me plainly, That *Passive Obedi-*"*ence* has been ever the Doctrine of the Church of *Eng-*"*land*. And when I say afterwards, So that it seems none "were accounted her true Sons, that did not hold it; if "he means, that none besides were accounted to hold her "Doctrines whole and entire, or to hold all the Truth "which she teaches, the Design of the Paper is to assert it "too.

But here I must admire the Author's Cunning extreamly, though I cannot much commend either his Ingenuity or good Nature; for although he does very peremptorily in his own Name tell the Person of Quality plainly, That *Passive Obedience* has been ever the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, yet he is so kind to Bishop *Lake* as to allow him the Honour of condemning all that did not receive it: For he owns it was the Design of the Paper to assert they were not true Sons that did not. But, first, I would know by what particular Privileg it is, that Bishop does take upon him to censure so many of his Brethren; and in the next Place I would be willing to be informed what Authority the Author had to pronounce such a Sentence against so many of his Superiours. But whether he will think fit to answer these two Queries or no, we have got a good Experiment by the by; for although at first he pretended Ignorance as to the Design of publishing the Paper, he now owns it with a Witness, by which it seems the Person of Quality was not so very much out in his Guess; but however, he did very wisely to lay all the Blame on the poor Bishop.

But by the Treatment the Living Clergy receive from him, you may suppose the Dead had not fared much better; for they had all certainly been cut off at one slap, but that, by good Fortune for them, he can bring them over to his Party. But that is the thing now to be examined; though having not at present the command of my Books, (as I told you at the beginning) I shall take the Gentleman's Quotations, hoping he has dealt a little more faithfully with his Authors, than he has with the Person of Quality in some places, as I shall shew hereafter.

And since for Expedition-sake I allow all his Citations; all that remains for me to consider, is, Whether his Inferences from them will hold or no. And in answer to what I urged of the Clergies giving Queen *Elizabeth* three such considerable Subsidies on the account of her assisting and protecting the Scotish and French Protestants, *&c.* he is pleased to undertake to prove two things: First, That *Queen* Elizabeth *did not assist the Scots or French in any Rebellion, but always declared the contrary.* But before he comes to that, he is to premise two things, which I shall very willingly yield him; The First is, that for Soveraign Princes in War to serve themselves of the Treachery and Revolt of another Prince's Subjects, is no more than what is always done, and is by the Law of Nations held lawful, and the necessity of Affairs seems to require it. Secondly, That it is lawful for Princes to make the best Terms they can, for Subjects that have *been serviceable to their Interest in a just War, tho by Rebellion against their own Prince.*

And now it may not be amiss to collect the Observations these two Positions will afford us: for the Premisses being granted on both sides, I hope the Conclusions will not be denied by either. And from the first we may infer that 'tis not only lawful, but sometimes necessary, to encourage Rebellion in a neighbouring Prince's Kingdom; or else I cannot very easily imagine what he means by saying, *The necessity of Affairs seems to require it.* For it seems the Good and Preservation of a Nation is a thing of such vast Concern, that Princes are dispensed with, and not obliged by the Rules of common Justice (as he himself tells us in the same page.) And since he is pleased to grant this, I know not why he should stick at the further Consequence, which he is sensible does naturally enough flow from the former, and therefore would prevent the Objection: And says, 'tis no good Consequence that Subjects may rebel, because foreign Princes may take advantage by their Rebellion to recover their own Rights, or to secure their Dominions. But if it be lawful for a King, for the Security of his own People, to raise or foment a Rebellion in his Neighbour's Country, I cannot see but it may be as lawful for Subjects to assert their own Rights against their own Prince, as it is to secure themselves

ſelves by ſetting others Subjects againſt their King, unleſs he will pleaſe to ſay that Subjects have no Intereſt nor Concern in the common Safety, but are obliged to ſtand ſtill to have their Throats cut, which would be a pretty odd Superſtructure upon the Foundation he juſt now laid. For ſurely the Diſpenſation that he ſays is given to Princes, by which they are exempt from following the Rules of Common Juſtice, was not given on their own but the Peoples account. And if a petty Prince may lawfully engage all the great Kingdoms of *Europe* in War and Confuſion for the Security of his own Subjects, ſhall the Rights of thoſe Subjects be ſo inconſiderable to them, that they muſt loſe them tamely, if their Prince ſhould miſtake his Office, or miſemploy his Power, and ſubvert thoſe Rights he is obliged to maintain? For although, by our Author's own Poſition, Kings may lawfully do unjuſt things for the Preſervation of the Rights and Liberties of their Subjects; yet neither this Author, nor any I have yet met with, will ſay that it is lawful for a King to deſtroy his Subjects, or ſubvert the Government, although indeed ſome have ſaid that we ought to ſubmit and be paſſive if they will do it. But truly our Author has given us too high a value of our Priviledges (which it ſeems are to be preferr'd before our King's Virtue and Juſtice) to make us part with them ſo eaſily. But perhaps we may be a little miſtaken in the Nature of Rebellion, and it may not be ſo great a Sin in ſome Countries as others; and ſo we may lawfully excite them to that which we are not to commit our ſelves: But beſides that, this is a little too much encroaching upon the Devil's Office, who was firſt known by the name of Tempter among Men, (and truly much upon the ſame ſcore that he allows Princes to do it for the Preſervation and Enlargement of their own Dominions) but beſides this, I ſay, if it be but a ſmall Sin in compariſon in other Countries to what it would be here; yet ſince our Saviour hath told us, *Mat.* 5. 19. *That he that teacheth Men to break one of the leaſt Commandments, ſhall be the leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven*; I thought this had been as ſtanding a Rule of the Church of *England* as Paſſive Obedience it ſelf. For to make another body ſin, I always thought not a leſſer, but a higher Guilt, than to commit it my ſelf, having

his

his Fact, as well as my own Contrivance, to answer for. For I think I may as lawfully be drunk my self, as designedly make another so. And in another Vice, the Procurer is thought more inexcusable and odious too, than the Party that employed them, who may perhaps be under a greater Temptation. But however, this is evident, that 'tis not the doing of the thing, but the taking pleasure in them that do it, that is by the Apostle, *Rom.* 1. 32. set down for the highest pitch of Sin and Wickedness. Therefore if, as our Author has observed, *the necessity of Affairs should require* us to become Tempters, let us not assume the other part of the Devil's Title, and turn Accusers of our Brethren also, and condemn them for that to which we have betrayed them, but find some gentler Name for that which our Author grants may not be only useful, but sometimes necessary, for the Preservation of a Nation. But although I have been longer on this than I designed, yet I must not wholly balk the second Position, for that will afford us some very useful Observations, for he tells us, "'Tis lawful for Princes to make the best Terms they can for Subjects that have been serviceable to their Interests in a just War, though by Rebellion against their own Prince. From which we may gather, that our Author thinks it possible for Subjects to be engaged in a just War against their own Prince: And if they may with Justice fight against their King for another Prince's Right, I cannot at all understand why they may not for their own. For surely the Safety of my own Country ought to be dearer to me than all the World besides; and I have more Reason to defend the Rights and Priviledges of that, than all the Princes Titles in the World. But if our Author should not allow all the Inferences I have made from his Concessions, yet I have a great deal of Reason to thank him for them, because they will not only be of use to me hereafter, but do at present in great measure supercede what I should else have said to his History. For 'tis perfectly indifferent to me, whether Queen *Elizabeth* did assist the French and Scotish Protestants or no, since by his first Position he grants, *She might have serv'd her self of the Treachery and Revolt of other Princes Subjects.* For 'twas the lawfulness of the Action, and not the Fact

Fact it self, that was the great point in question: and since he allows she might have assisted them, though they had been Rebels, we will never quarrel about it, whether they were so or no. For truly, the Person of Quality is very well pleased that he has so learned an Author of his side, that proves all he desires should be asserted in the point: For since he will allow the French Protestants were not Rebels, because they had the Law of their side: Nor were the *Netherlands* guilty of Rebellion against the King of *Spain*, because he first acted contrary to the *Laetus Introitus*, *and disengaged them from their Obedience, when he had broke the Condition of it.* If he will but please to be as gracious to his own Country-men, and allow them the benefit of their own Laws, and suffer the Oaths of Princes to be as binding in *England*, as it seems they then were in *Spain*, I know no body that will desire any more of him. Nay, I will go farther than this; for if he can name any one Person that was a Rebel to King *James* after the Allowances above are granted him; rather than he should go unpunish'd, I think I should be his Executioner; for I hate those that rebel against, and break the Laws, as much as the Author can do: And since Rebellion is so horrid a Sin, I would not have *England* to have the Enclosure of it; but only desire that we may be allowed to fight for our Laws and Liberties, as other Nations do, without being thought Rebels for so doing. But if our Author will not allow us the same Priviledges he gives to all the World beside, there would be some reason to suspect that he designs us the Monopoly of that he so exclaims against; and is so particularly kind to his own Country, as sometimes to lay them under the unhappy necessity of being either Rebels or Slaves. And I have something the more Reason to fear this, because I find he is not so solicitous to clear the *Scots* from the imputation of Rebels, as he is the *French* and *Dutch*. But let them be what they will, you see 'tis evident Queen *Elizabeth* did not assist them; she only furnish'd them with Men, Money, and Ammunition. And when the Queen of *Scots* came and flung her self into her Protection, and implored her Aid for restoring her to her Crown, she then asserted her Cause with a witness. For had that unhappy Princess trusted to the Mercy of her Sub-

Page 33.

jects,

jects, as great Rebels as they were, I am ſure they could not have treated her worſe than ſhe was uſed by that Queen, who our Author tells us, *always declared againſt any Protection of Subjects in their Reſiſtance, which ſhe always called Rebellion.* But I ſuppoſe Princes are no more obliged to ſpeak Truth, than they are tied to do Juſtice; for which our Author gave them a Diſpenſation before.

But I think it now time to proceed to the 2*d* thing he undertook to prove, which is, "That it was the Doctrine of "the Church of *England* at that time, that it is unlawful for "Subjects to reſiſt, and that therefore our Divines juſti-"fied the *French* and *Dutch* no otherwiſe than upon Prin-"ciples which are conſiſtent with this Doctrine. And truly if our Author hold in the ſame mind he was when he promiſed the two Poſitions (before enlarged on) and acquitted the *French* from Rebellion, becauſe they had the Law of their Side; and the *Dutch*, becauſe their King had forfeited his Right to their Obedience by breaking his part of the Pact and Stipulation between them; I do not ſee but he and I ſhall agree in this, as well as the Divines of this Age do with thoſe in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Days. For I ſuppoſe the Convocation at that time did approve of Biſhop *Bilſon* his Sentiments as to that matter; for the Author tells us the Book was peruſed and allowed by publick Authority, and alſo dedicated to the Queen; ſo that it ſeems to be that which they were all willing to ſtand by. And I heartily wiſh that all our Biſhops would do ſo too, and make that very Paſſage he cites out of Biſhop *Bilſon* the Judg of the Controverſy; for then I think it would be pretty ſoon decided; and therefore I ſhall tranſcribe the Place in the very ſame words he has done, *page* 33.

"In *France*, the King of *Navar* and the Prince of *Conde* "might lawfully defend themſelves from Injuſtice and Vio-"lence, and be aided by other Princes their Neighbours, "If the King, as too mighty for them, ſought to oppreſs "them, to whom they owe not ſimple Subjection, but "reſpective Homage, as *Scotland* did to *England*, and "*Normandy* to *France*, when the Kings notwithſtanding "had bitter Wars each with other. The reſt of the No-

"bles

" bles that did assist them, if it were the King's Act that " did oppress them and not the *Guises*, except the Laws do " permit them means to save the State from open Ty- " ranny, I will not excuse; and yet the Circumstances " must be fully known before the Fact can be rightly dis- " cerned, with which I confess I am not so exactly ac- " quainted. Now in this Passage here are three several things observable.

First, He absolutely acquits the King of *Navar* and Prince of *Conde*, but their Associates only upon Supposition, that the Law permitted them to oppose the King's Tyranny; but the *Guises* Oppression they might without Law. But although the Bishop says, he will not excuse those that resist the King without Law, yet it is pretty remarkable that he seems to suppose that even in such a Case, there may be Circumstances which may render them excusable, and which ought to be fully known before the Fact can be discerned, and therefore he does forbear passing his Judgment on them, because he is not thorowly acquainted with the Circumstances. And now were all our Divines of this good Bishop's Faith in this Point, or at least had they but his Charity, and would not condemn their Brethren before they understood the Cause, they would certainly understand one another a little better than they do, or however there would be no Divisions nor Schismes about it, which God grant they do not now make in the Church. But whatever others do, we are I hope sure of our Reverend Author, for he has proved that the Clergy in Q. *Elizabeth* were of his Faith as to this Question, therefore should have thought it unnecessary to have said any thing more, but that for the Authors Information, I must answer an Objection or two about *David*, whose Example though so much recommended, might perhaps carry us farther, and give greater Liberties than the Person of Quality ever desired; for I'le assure you, defensive Arms will at any time content him. But our Author is pleased to ask how it appears, *David* took up defensive Arms, for the *Homily* tells us of no such thing. But I can tell him of as Authentick a Book that does; nay that tells us a little more of *David*: for if he will please to

Page 39.

read 1 *Sam.* 28. 2. and 29. 8. he will find it was not *David*'s Fault that he did not uſe offenſive Weapons againſt *Saul*, if fighting againſt him be to be called ſo; for if we may believe his own Words, he certainly intended that as you may ſee, 1 *Sam.* 28. *And it came to paſs in thoſe Days, that the Philiſtines gathered their Armies together for Warfare, to fight with* Iſrael: *and* Achiſh *ſaid unto* David, *Know thou aſſuredly, that thou ſhalt go out with me to battel, thou and thy Men. And* David *ſaid to* Achiſh, *Surely thou ſhalt know what thy Servant can do. And* Achiſh *ſaid to* David, *therefore will I make thee Keeper of mine Head for ever.* And in Purſuance of this we find *David* and his Men attending *Achiſh* (the very Day before the Battel) as his particular Guard, which perhaps might be one thing that diſguſted the Lords of the *Philiſtins* ſo, that they would not let him go to fight with them; and *Achiſh* againſt his Will is forced to diſmiſs *David*, whoſe Expoſtulation, *Chap.* 29. 8. is very remarkable, for I think 'tis one of the moſt paſſionate things of the kind I have met with; *And* David *ſaid unto* Achiſh, *But what have I done? and what haſt thou found in thy Servant ſo long as I have been with thee unto this Day? that I may not go fight againſt the Enemies of my Lord the King.* And *Achiſh* was forced to command him a ſecond time, for you ſee he diſputed the firſt; which ſatisfies me that he was in earneſt, and was unwilling to return. And now what can be ſaid againſt ſo plain a Text? For my own part I can foreſee but two things: the Firſt, That *David* did diſſemble with *Achiſh*, and did not intend to fight: but that I think is a very unworthy Thought, for *David* had been a very baſe and ungrateful Man to have either deceived or betrayed *Achiſh*, who had given him Protection, and was ſo truly kind to him. The ſecond thing is, That a Subject may liſt himſelf under a Foreign Prince, and in his quarrel lawfully fight againſt their own King; and if ſo, then all that liſted themſelves under the Prince of *Orange*, might ſtill be as good Subjects to King *James* as *David* at that time was to *Saul*: And as to the proof of his taking up defenſive Arms, he may find that 1 *Sam.* 22. 2. *And every one that was in Diſtreſs, and every one that was in Debt, and every one that was diſcontented, gathered themſelves*

unto

unto him, and he became Captain over them. And here is as formal levying of War, as I think can be desired; and if it was not to defend himself, I know not to what purpose it was; for if he desired only Flight, he might have done that safer as well as privater by himself than with an Army. Nor was that Army of any use as to the gaining of the Crown after *Saul*'s Death; for God commanded him to go and live at *Hebron*; where the Men of *Judah* of their own Accord went down and made him King, as he will find 2 *Sam.* 2. So that so many hundred Men from the beginning to the ending were of no use unless it were to defend him against *Saul*; and that he did design to have garison'd *Keilah*, but that God told him the Men of the Place would betray him: I think nothing can be more evident from any Text, in Spight of all the Author's Comments. But now he refers me to the last *Homily* against Rebellion, as I did him to the second; and asks me, whether King *John*'s Subjects took up only defensive Arms? But by Bishop *Bilson*'s excellent Rule above cited, neither he nor I ought to judg them because we do not, nor cannot know all their Circumstances: For Historians are seldom so impartial as to give us all things in their true Colours. But the Design of that *Homily* was only to shew the Intolerableness of the Romish Yoke, and how impossible it was for them that depended on and obeyed the *Pope* to be good Subjects. But as for King *John* himself, he had been as great a Traitor, and used him that should have been his Soveraign, as ill as his Subjects could do him; for all the World knows that he first usurp'd the Crown, and then killed Prince *Arthur* that was the true Heir. And truly if their present Majesties would have pursued King *John*'s Method, they might before this have had as indisputable a Title, and had as much Right to have been called Natural Soveraign Lord, as King *John* had. But shall they have the less Respect, and be the worse thought on, because they spared the Life of our late unfortunate King, and suffered him to escape when he was in their Power, nay would not abridg him of his Liberty, although they knew he would use it against their Interest? If this be the Quarrel that the Clergy have against King *William*, I shall admire their Politicks a great

Page 42.

deal more than their Divinity. But to return to King *John*: What Cauſe our Anceſtors might have to repent them of their Wars againſt him I know not, but I believe their Poſterity think they have not much, for it produced thoſe great Priviledges wherein the *Engliſh* Subjects glory. The Charter obtained from him being the firſt part, or firſt Draught if you pleaſe, of the famous *Magna Charta*, confirmed afterwards by *Henry* the 3*d*. whom the Homily might have cited as well as King *John*, if it had been the Subjects Rebellion, and not the Pope's Uſurpation that they deſigned to declaim againſt. But although I am very far from juſtifying all that was done in thoſe two King's Reigns, yet I think verily the Author would have a harder Task to perſwade the People of *England* to give up the Advantages they hold from it. And I think I may undertake to call back both King *James* and *Popery* (for they deceive themſelves that think they are to be ſeparated, for could they have been divided he need never to have forſaken his Crown and Kingdom) when he ſhall prevail with the People of this Nation to give up their *Magna Charta*: For if the former never return (as I pray God they may not) till we are willing to part with the latter; both the Author and I may have Reaſon to ſay as *Hezekiah* does, *Iſaiah* 39. *Good is the Word of the Lord, for Peace and Truth ſhall be in my Days.* But although 'tis a very true Rule that we muſt not do Evil, that Good may come of it, yet when Evil is done (eſpecially if without our Conſent) it is certainly very lawful both to enjoy and rejoice in that Good which God Almighty by his infinite Wiſdom ſhall bring out of it; and if our Author is ſo tender conſcienced, that he is of another Mind, and will not receive Advantage from any thing which ſprings from other Peoples Sins, he muſt not only deny the Priviledges of his Birth-Right as an *Engliſh-Man*, but even his Chriſtianity alſo: For was there ever ſo horrid a Sin as crucifying the Son of God? And yet what a loſt undone World has this been, if that had not happened? And although for ten thouſand Worlds I would not be the Traytor *Judas*, nor any of the impenitent *Jews*, yet with what *Hallelujahs* ought we to celebrate that Divine Goodneſs, that from Man's greateſt

greateſt Sin, and the Devil's higheſt Malice could thus work out Mans Salvation. Aud indeed Events of this Nature ſeem to be the great Abyſs of God's Wiſdom, as well as Goodneſs, which Man's ſhallow Reaſon muſt never pretend to ſound: but however we may adore what we cannot comprehend, and with the Apoſtle cry out, *O Altitudo*, Rom. 11. 33. *Oh the Height and the Depth of the Riches, both of the Wiſdom and Knowledg of God! How unſearchable are his Judgments, and his Ways paſt finding out!* And perhaps this might be a better Employment for all our Thoughts than to cenſure and quarrel with our Brethren, becauſe they are not of our Sentiments in all Points, and if they think themſelves ſo much in the Right, yet pray let them remember the Apoſtle's Rules, *That they which are ſtrong ought to bear with the Infirmities of the weak, and not to pleaſe themſelves*, Rom. 15. 1. And he alſo commands the *Galatians*, that they *bear one anothers Burdens, and ſo to fulfil the Law of Chriſt.* But alas, inſtead of following this Method, we rather chuſe to imitate the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, who by laying heavy Burdens on other Mens Shoulders, thought to diſcharge their own Duty. But for all they ſat in *Moſes*'s Seat, yet all their Comments on the Law were not true, nor were all Conjectures falſe that contradicted their received Opinions and Infallibility; which being no more intailed on the Chair now, than it was then, it would be very happy if all ſides would remember and obſerve *Gamaliel*'s Advice to the *Jews*, who ſaid very well when he told them, *Acts* 5. 38. *If this Counſel and Work be of Men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, leſt happily ye be found to fight againſt God.* Therefore it would be Piety as well as Diſcretion for both ſides to attend a little, and not divide from, much leſs fall foul upon one another, till they are ſure that by ſo doing they ſhall not oppoſe God alſo. Although I muſt confeſs I have ſome Temptation to believe from what has already happened, that it is the Lords Doing; and that upon this Conſideration, that all the ways of returning to King *James*, are guarded by the blackeſt and fouleſt Sins that a Nation can poſſibly be guilty of; and you muſt break thorow, that is commit all of them before you can open

any

any one Door for his Return. For 1*st*. There would be the greateſt Falſeneſs, and higheſt Ingratitude in the World, againſt a Prince that put his Life in his Hand, and expoſed his own Perſon to the greateſt Hazard to reſcue a periſhing Church and ſinking Nation. 2*dly*. No Perſon can ſo much as treat of ſuch a thing without incurring the Guilt of Treaſon, for by the ancient Laws of the Land 'tis Treaſon to conſpire againſt the King *de facto*. Then 3*dly*. There would be the ſame Guilt of Perjury in breaking an Oath to him as to King *James*. 4*thly*. They muſt betray God's Church, and the true Religion, and give up their Country to Ruin and Devaſtation; and conſequently have all the Blood to anſwer for, that ſhould be ſhed in ſuch an unhappy Revolution: So that were King *James*'s Return a good Worth projecting for on other Accounts, yet that ſtanding Rule of St. *Paul*'s, *That you muſt not do Evil that Good may come of it*, ought to deter any body from attempting it; but when the thing it ſelf, if compaſs'd, would be the greateſt Miſchief, it would then be the greateſt Height of Madneſs as well as Sin to go about it. For can any body think that the deſtroying a Church and Nation, nay extirpating the true Faith out of the World (that is, as far as we can go towards it) is ſo meritorious a thing, that it will legitimate the uſe of thoſe means, which it was not lawful to uſe, no not for the planting of the Goſpel; and if any Man can think this but a *Jeſuit* (for a good honeſt moral *Papiſt* I believe will not) I ſhould indeed think it a great Infatuation; but however that would not alter the Nature of things, but my Rule would ſtill remain unſhaken; for the way to Duty always lies plain and open, *ſo that he that runs may read*. And although ſometimes it may be attended with Sufferings, yet I am confident never any Perſon had the fatal Neceſſity of ſining laid on him, to enable him to diſcharge any Part of his Duty to God or Man. But I beg Pardon for this Digreſſion which proved longer than I at firſt deſigned it, but yet I ſhall not think it impertinent if it proves uſeful to the undeceiving of any that have been carried out of the way by the ſpecious Pretence of Loyalty. But to return to my Author.

And the next thing we are to consider, is the Epithet of the distinguishing Character of the Church of *England*; and you may remember that I ask'd you whether you thought it necessary for particular Churches to have particular distinguishing Doctrines; for that to me it appear'd so far from necessary, that I thought it very inconvenient. But he tells us as to that, "Whether distinguishing Doctrines "be convenient or inconvenient, it is according as the "Doctrines are good or bad. No doubt it is inconvenient "to have bad distinguishing Doctrines, but it is as certain "that it is very convenient for a Church to have distinguishing Doctrines, provided they be good ones, unless "a Church can be obliged to err for Company, and to avoid Distinction. But I would be very glad to know upon what *Thesis* it is he grounds this dogmatical Conclusion, That a Church must needs err that holds only the Catholick Faith, and has not some particular Doctrine of its own to distinguish it from other Churches by. This did not seem to be the Rule of the Apostles, who when they were to preach to all the World, were so afraid of Distinction and Divisions in their Churches, that before they parted, it is generally supposed they agreed of a common form of Words, which they all delivered to their Converts, and was not to be the distinguishing Doctrine of any particular Church, but the common Badg of their Christianity, and is I suppose that to which St. *Paul* refers, when he charges his Son *Timothy*, to *hold fast the form of sound Words, which thou hast heard of me*, 2 Tim. 1. 13. and he also tells us, that the Design of his leaving him at *Ephesus* was, *that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other Doctrine*, 1 Tim. 1. 3. And the first Request that St. *Paul* makes to his *Corinthians*, is, *That you all speak the same things, and there be no Divisions among you, but that you be perfectly joyn'd together in the same Mind, and in the same Judgment*, 1 Cor. 1. 10. And this being a thing of such extraordinary Concern, he does not only make use of his own Authority, but as it was the Custom of the *Jews* to adjure by the Name of God when they would oblige any Person to answer truly, as the High Priest did to our Saviour, *Mat.* 22. 63. So how the Apostle usurs in his Request with the same Solemnity,

Now

Now I beſeech you, Brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: thereby to oblige them the more carefully to obſerve what he ſays, from which you may gueſs how far he was from thinking diſtinguiſhing Doctrines neceſſary, that he would not tolerate them. And if Unity were ſo neceſſary among Chriſtians then, is it leſs ſo now? Or what Neceſſity is there of being ſo uncharitable as to ſuppoſe all the Churches erroneous in their Creeds but our ſelves? *That 'tis now convenient for particular Churches to* make new Articles of Faith, *and have their diſtinguiſhing Doctrines, unleſs they will be obliged to err for Company.* I thought it had been all along one of the great Charges againſt the Church of *Rome* their making ſuch large *Addenda's* to our Creed, and making the Belief of ſome Points neceſſary to Salvation, which neither our Saviour nor his Apoſtles taught: and that Churches abounding ſo with diſtinguiſhing Doctrines, and impoſing them upon others for Catholick Truths, has formerly been look'd upon as one of their great Errors; but I perceive, Sir, that was a great Miſtake, for this Learned Author tells me, " That although the avoiding Diſtinc-
" on does not very well agree with the Practice of the
" Primitive Chriſtians; yet it agrees admirably with the
" Principles of Popery thus to avoid Diſtinction, which has
" its Numbers to boaſt on, when nothing elſe can be ſaid.
But if their Unity and Number is the only thing that the Author has to object againſt the Papiſts, I could as ſoon be reconciled to their Uncharitableneſs as his; for Heaven I perceive is to be the Encloſure of his diſtinguiſhing Doctrines, or at leaſt no body is to be thought a Member of the true Church, unleſs they hold that, and this ſtrange Uncharitableneſs is that which does convince me of the great Inconvenience of diſtinguiſhing Doctrines; for generally ſpeaking all ſides are ſo apt to value themſelves upon them, that they are ready with the Men in the Prophet *Iſaiah* 65. 5. to cry, *Stand by thy ſelf, come not near me, for I am holier than thou.* And did we preſs our ſelves only for doing our Duty, and adhering to our Common Creed, it might be the more pardonable: But alas, *'Tis not the Faith that was once delivered to the Saints,* Jude 3. that *we thus earneſtly contend for*; for a Man may hold all that, and yet be pronounced a Heretick,

unleſs

unleſs he chance to agree with them in all their Opinions, which are now to be the Standard of our Faith. But whether the breach of Charity and Unity among our ſelves, is the readieſt way to *build us up in our moſt holy Faith*, our ſad Experience will I doubt too ſoon ſhew. But however, ſure I am it does not agree very well with Saint *Jude*'s Method, *ver.* 21. who bids us *keep our ſelves in the Love of God*, and then we may *look for the Mercy of Chriſt unto Eternal Life*. But becauſe it is ſo poſſible to deceive our ſelves, Saint *John* has given us an infallible *Criterion*, whereby we may know whether we love God or no, for he tells us, 1 *Epiſt.* 4. 20. *If a Man ſay he loveth God, and hateth his Brother, he is a Liar: for he that loveth not his Brother whom he hath ſeen, how can he love God whom he hath not ſeen? Therefore this Commandment have we from him, that he that loveth God, loveth his Brother alſo.* Therefore ſince God has made our Brother, as it were, his Proxy to receive the Proofs of our Love to him; and our Saviour has made it the Badg of our Diſciplehip, *By this ſhall all Men know that you are my Diſciples, if ye love one another:* It is very unhappy that thoſe that pretend to be ſo, ſhould ſet up another Touch-ſtone for the Trial of their Sincerity, and think to approve their Love to God by their Zeal againſt their Brethren, if they chance to diſſent from them in a bare Opinion. Although our Saviour did not ſay, by their Faith and diſtinguiſhing Doctrines, but by their Love to one another, Men ſhall know whether you are my Diſciples or no. Therefore I think it is not ſtrange if no Church be fond of thoſe Opinions that will engage them to depoſit their Charity; and if they are, 'tis certainly their Failing, not their Excellence.

But now it ſeems I am to beg the Author's Pardon, for thinking that the diſtinguiſhing Doctrine of ſuch a Church had been that which was peculiar to it; for it ſeems a diſtinguiſhing Doctrine is that which they held in common with other Churches, which truly I did not underſtand before. And if this Doctrine be ſo, yet the appro-

priating of it to one, looks as if they had a mind to have the Encloſure of it.

But I skipped one ſhort Paragraph, wherein our Author, according to his fair way of treating the Perſon of Quality, has jumbled two Texts together, which were cited on different Accounts, as will be apparent to any body that conſults the Paper. For when from our having but *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm*, I was willing to infer the reaſonableneſs of being (or at leaſt endeavouring to be) all of one Mind. I did not think that had been ſuch an Error as ſtood in need of a Confutation. But now he asks, And muſt not then thoſe, that held one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, neceſſarily diſtinguiſh themſelves from all that held more than one? But I think there is diſtinction enough made to our Hands, for thoſe Hereticks that firſt ſet up thoſe Errors, and ſeparated from the Church on their account, I hope were diſtinguiſhable enough from the true Church; and if others hold two Gods, or firſt Principles, with the *Manichees*, muſt I therefore have a particular Doctrine to diſtinguiſh me from that Church that holds but one? And becauſe ſome are to blame in making Factions, and crying up *Apollos*, or *Cephas*, muſt I for fear of mixing with them, diſtinguiſh my ſelf from thoſe that are of *Chriſt?* For, God be thanked, there never yet was a time that Truth was left ſo without witneſs, but that there was a true Church, to which if we adhered, we need not ſet up diſtinguiſhing Doctrines for our ſelves, the Inconvenience of which I am now more than ever ſatisfied of.

And now he ſhould come to my ſecond Inference, but he paſſes it over very gently, only denies the Conſequence, for
Page 45. he ſaith, "This doth not imply that all who have taken "the Oath, have thereby renounced the Church of *Eng-* "*land*. And in this I muſt own the Author's Candor, for I believe, Sir, you know ſome that are of another Mind, and that have urged this very Profeſſion of Biſhop *Lake*'s to prove it. Although I never ſaid it was Biſhop *Lake*'s Opinion, as he very unjuſtly accuſes me, and although the Charge is ſome pages off, yet belonging to this Point, I think I may under it, take the opportunity of clearing my ſelf. His Words

Words are theſe, "But when this Gentleman muſt needs *Page* 50.
"know that his Lordſhip at the ſame time received the Ho-
"ly Sacrament at the Hand of a Reverend Divine who has
"taken the Oath, to inſinuate that he would hardly allow
"thoſe who have taken the new Oath, to be ſo much as out-
"Liers of the Church of *England*, is a thing I confeſs I can
"ſcarce reconcile to any degree of Charity. But yet I do not queſtion but that all I there ſaid is full as conſiſtent with the great Doctrine of Charity, as firſt the making a Falſity, and then charging the malicious Inferences of it on their Brother. But I muſt confeſs this is a ſort of dealing that I did not at all expect from ſo ingenious an Adverſary; for I know there were weak Places enow in my Paper, that he needed not have been reduced to thoſe pitiful ſhifts: but the confuting of the Paper would not ſatisfy, unleſs he alſo laid an Odium on the Perſon, whom I am ſure he does not know, but has the good Fortune to have a beter Character from them that do. But the Paſſage to which he refers, and does ſo falſly render, is this: After the Story of the dying Papiſt, I ſay, "That I am confident the Biſhop would
"not have approved of the Argument, had I turned Papiſt
"on that dying Man's Declaration. But it ſeems ſome
"think it no great matter what we turn now; for I
"hear ſome are ſo exceeding fierce, that they will hardly
"allow thoſe which have taken the new Oaths, to be ſo
"much as Out-Liers of the Church of *England*: And then I add immediately after, "But although the indiſcreet Zeal
"of ſome have made them ſo uncharitable, I am far from
"ſuppoſing it the Temper of all the worthy Men of that
"Party. Now I'le be judg'd by all the World, what there is in this Clauſe that refers to Biſhop *Lake*, or does ſo much as inſinuate that he was one of thoſe fierce ones: nay, any one may ſee that I take particular care to free the worthy Men of it; and if our Author will take Biſhop *Lake* out of that Liſt, and number him with the indiſcreetly zealous, (who are the only People I charge) I cannot help that; but be it known to the World, that is his doing, and not mine. But although he accuſes me for want of Charity, I think I ſhall ſhew that I have a great deal, ſince I

can forgive this. For as I thank God I am (whatever my Quality is) above ſuch mean Tricks, ſo I am above revenging of them too, for ſuch Crimes are commonly their own Lictors. For I am confident he will ſuffer more by it than I ſhall, therefore 'tis generally my Pity and not my Anger that it excites on ſuch occaſions. But now to return, if this be a Digreſſion, I am glad to find our Author think that there are ſo many accounts on which the Oaths may lawfully be taken, but it is not my Task to examine any Man on which of thoſe different Hypotheſes they took it; for having ſatisfied the Law, and I am ſo charitable as to believe their own Conſciences alſo, I have nothing to object againſt it. For I am ſo far from diſapproving a tender Conſcience, that I would have all the liberty in the World allowed to thoſe who are truly ſo; ſo that his Queſtion was a little ſuperfluous as to me, *And muſt thoſe of the Church of* England *only not be allowed to have tender Conſciences?* But I am really ſorry to find that any of the Church of *England* ſhould think they are abridged of the liberty of theirs, if they may not declaim againſt all thoſe that diſſent from them; for as I think the Author is very free, ſo I think 'tis very fit every body ſhould enjoy their own Sentiments, and I hope I ſhall not be denied the Liberty I grant, but that is only in private; for I know no neceſſity of impoſing them on others, nor condemning all that do not approve of them. And that is the main, and indeed the only Exception I have to Biſhop *Lake*'s Profeſſion; for I did ſuſpect, and the Author himſelf is ſo ingenuous as to own, that the deſign of the Paper was to aſſert that none were true Sons of the Church of *England*, (that is, as he himſelf explains it, *did not hold her Doctrine whole and entire*) that did not hold the Doctrine of Paſſive Obedience in the ſame ſenſe Biſhop *Lake* did. And now I cannot but ſay this looks aſſuming enough, but however our Author aſſures us, that "the making this Profeſſion, was the moſt proper, and "the moſt ſeaſonable and charitable thing a dying Biſhop "could do, to declare that nothing but Conſcience was "the Cauſe of his Refuſal. And although I do verily believe it might be ſo in the good Man's Intentions, yet I cannot

not say it was so, or was likely to be so in the Effects, although we are told it *was an Action that did naturally tend to our Peace.* For a Surgeon may wish very well to his Patient, and yet mistake in his Applications; for if he use Corrosives, where Oil and Balsam were needful, he will be more like to fester than heal the Sore. And truly I must needs say, that a dying Man's entring a Protestation against a whole Party, looks as it were designed to perpetuate, not compose a Dispute: However I am sure it is much properer for the former than the latter. For the shortning of this, (which much exceeds the Bulk I designed) I have been forced to skip whole Pages, to lay those things together that belonged to one Head, but having all along cited the Author's own Words, I hope I have done neither him nor the Reader much injury. But now we will go a little back, and pick up what may be of use in the way. And in the first place, I am very well pleased to find him so much concerned for any thing that reflects on their present Majesties, but I am half afraid lest some that should have more Wit, teach us of the Laity the ill-breeding he talks on; for I could tell him of one, that in the Convocation said, the King had sent them a *bantring Message*, and they had sent him a *bantring Address*: But I suppose the Gentleman does not value himself so much on his Jest, but that he is willing enough to have his Name conceal'd. But however, it would be well if the Clergy would set us better Example, although I cannot justify any body for following their ill.

I do not at all question what he says of the Dissenting Bishops, for did they but once own themselves to be their Majesties Subjects, I do verily believe they would be as good, if not better Subjects than any they have; and I am confident one might take their Words in the point, and not exact an Oath from them, if that be all they scruple at, with which they might long ago, I believe, have been dispensed, had they offered any other Security. For I believe their Majesties have as great Respect and Inclination too for the Bishops, as the Bishops can have for them,

and

and particularly to him that he mentions, to whom the whole Nation muſt ever own a great Obligation, for his Care and Diligence in ſo well principling the two Royal Siſters; and 'tis a great deal of pity he ſhould deny them the Satisfaction they would take in repaying his great Service.

There now follow ſome Pages, with which I think I have little to do, he that is concerned in them being ſo able to anſwer for himſelf; but yet rather than have nothing to ſay to the *Perſon of Quality*, he will quarrel with him on his Friend *Julian*'s account. But had the Author obſerved the Rule he impoſes, and not made uſe of any Arguments that had been urged before, I believe the Perſon of Quality's part would have been much ſhorter in his laſt Pamphlet than it is. But however of all things I thought the Laws and Statutes of a Nation had been in common, and not like a *Terra Incognita*, only to be appropriated to the uſe of the firſt *Diſcoverer*, that is in this caſe the firſt *Citer*. But that he may not fear that I ſhould hereafter make any Encroachments on the Prerogatives of ſo good a Friend, I ſhall (and I am ſure with Truth) declare that I am not only a Stranger to his Perſon, but alſo ſo much to his Writings, that I never heard of the conceit of *grinning Honour* before, but from Sir *John Falſtaff* in the Play; but however I do believe 'tis a very good Jeſt, becauſe ſo ingenuous an Author repeats it ſo often. But for any thing more, I ſhall ſay as the Parents of the blind Man did, *Ask him, he is of Age, let him ſpeak for himſelf.*

But it is well if I can do ſo for my ſelf, for my hardeſt Task is yet to come, for alas, I am to anſwer for a *whole Community*; for at laſt our ſagacious Author has diſcovered that the *Perſon of Quality* is ſo: though to tell you truly, I never knew before that I had Pigs in my Belly, much leſs that I was with Child of a whole Corporation. But although 'tis againſt the Canon, I doubt I muſt anſwer for them all my ſelf, for I fear the Author will not be ſo kind as to be Godfather to any of my Productions, ſo I muſt provide for them as well as

as I can. But ſince Charity begins at home, I muſt firſt conſider my ſelf in my private Capacity, and in that am reſolved (as he ſees) to be as paſſive as he himſelf can deſire: And altho 'tis poſſible I may have more than one Title to be diſtinguiſhed by, yet truly I will not vie with the Author in that point, to which purpoſe I will tell him a Story: An unlucky Fellow met with Doctor *Harding* on the Road, and knowing that he had divers Preferments, he rides before to the Inn, and told the Hoſt there was a great deal of Company to come to his Houſe that Night, and therefore bid him get all the good things he could provide for Supper; for, ſays he, there is the Parſon of St. *Martins*, the Dean of ſuch a Place, the Prebendary of another, and ſo reckoned up all his Places. And at this rate 'tis poſſible the Author may much better deſerve to be thought a Community than poor Me; but however I ſhall anſwer his jocund Diſcourſe a little more ſeriouſly. And I am ſure I need not tell him that a new Relation does alſo lay a new Obligation and Duty, and that ſometimes ſo contrary to the former, that what was a Vertue and commendable in one State, may be really a Fault in another. As for Inſtance, for a ſingle Man to give all his Goods and Poſſeſſions to charitable Uſes, is counted a great and heroick piece of Charity; but ſhould the ſame Perſon marry and have a great many Children, ſhould he by his Charity diſenable himſelf from providing for his Family, if he will take St. *Paul*'s Word, *That Man has denied the Faith, and is worſe than an Infidel*, for thoſe are the Words of the Cenſure that he paſſes, 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. on him *that provides not for his own, eſpecially thoſe of his own Houſe*. So that we may ſee what a vaſt difference an additional Relation makes in the ſelf-ſame Action. And me-thinks I ſhould not need to apply this to the Point in hand; but becauſe he is ſo apt to miſtake the Perſon of Quality's meaning, I ſhall tell him that when there is nothing but my own Right in queſtion, I will quietly ſacrifice that to my King's Pleaſure, and for my Countries Peace. But if I am in a Publick Office, and made

as

it were a Truſtee for my Country, to look after and maintain its Rights and Priviledges, neither Fear nor Favour ſhould ever prevail with me to part with one Tittle of it. Therefore I think the *Houſe of Commons* have propoſed very well to lay a Brand on them who did voluntarily deliver up their Charters, and thereby betray thoſe Liberties they were ſworn to maintain: for, for my part I cannot underſtand why I am not as much obliged by the Oath that I take for the Defence of my Country, and the maintaining of the Rights and Franchiſes of ſuch a Town, as I am by the Oaths of Allegiance to the King; for if the King break his Oath, and infringe thoſe Liberties he has ſworn to protect, yet I do not ſee how he can abſolve or diſpence with mine, unleſs we make him Pope as well as King. But however, if that Doctrine of *Paſſive*, or if you pleaſe we will call it *Implicit* Obedience to the King is binding, I cannot ſee how 'tis poſſible for the Subjects to avoid Perjury under ſuch a Reign as our late King *James*; for was it not as downright Perjury for a Mayor of a Town to deliver up the Charter he was ſo ſolemnly ſworn to maintain, as it would have been to have reſiſted the King in the Defence of it? But this of being perjured, take which ſide you will, is ſuch an unhappy Neceſſity, as I believe God never laid on any one; therefore ſuppoſe that in ſuch Exigencies there is yet a way to extricate ones ſelf without committing the Sin. And truly to do the Author right, I have not met with a better Reſolution of the Law, than what he himſelf thinks fit to urge in the behalf of the *Netherlands*, when they flung off their Subjection to the King of *Spain*; and if he will pleaſe to apply that to his own Scruples, I think he need not go any further for a Solution, therefore ſuppoſe it ſuperfluous for me to ſay any more on that Point, for if he will not be his own Convert, I cannot hope he ſhould ever be mine.

And now, at laſt, *SIR*, we are come to the concluding, and, as he calls it, *ſtabbing Queſtion of* London-Derry.

ry. But really, Sir, the Perſon of Quality had no ſuch murderous Intention, but ſince the Weapon was ſo in its own Nature, it was very happy it fell into ſuch unskilful Hands, for elſe no body knows what Execution it might have done. But how ill ſoever I managed my Dagger, I perceive he is a little afraid of it, and will not come near the Queſtion; but that he may be ſure to be out of my reach, he is ſending me as far as *Troy*. But methinks I need not go ſo far for the Anſwer of one poor Queſtion. But here our Author is forced to his old ſhifts of ſhuffling and packing the Cards; for he has really the beſt Faculty of ſingling out one Line out of a Sentence; and leſt it ſhould not appear ridiculous enough by it ſelf, joins it to another I know not how far off, to which it had no Coherence, as he has done in ſeveral others as well as this place: for my Query is in theſe very words; "Whether they did not both "wiſh and pray, that *London-Derry* ſhould be delivered out "of the Hands of thoſe mercileſs Butchers? And this the "Excellency of their Temper, as well as their Chriſtianity, "obliging to, I cannot at all queſtion but they did; nay, I "verily believe they would have gone farther, and aſſiſted "them with their Purſes, if they had known how to have "conveyed them Relief. And how faithfully he renders it, and how fully he anſwers it, you ſhall gueſs from his own Words, which I'le aſſure you are tranſcribed a little exacter than he does mine: "It is, *ſays he*, the Duty of Chriſtians "to pray for Righteouſneſs, and Truth, and Peace to all "Mankind: How ſtrange a Queſtion is it therefore to ask, "Whether the ſuſpended Clergy did not both wiſh and "pray that *London-Derry* ſhould be delivered out of the "Hands of mercileſs Butchers? (for *thoſe* is to be left out in that place for ſome Reaſons beſt known to himſelf.) He "believes they did, becauſe there were many thouſand "innocent Perſons whom they never ſaw, and who never "did them any wrong. And now I will appeal to my Reader if here is not a Paſſage as faithfully cited, and as well applied as ever he ſaw. For let the Queſtion be what it will, it would be pretty much if it be *ſtranger* than the Anſwer: So that I think the ſuſpended Clergy are not much more obliged to him, *for bringing them in ſo needleſly, and uſing*

ſuch weighty Arguments in their behalf, than the *Derry*-Men, as he ſays, are to me. There is only this Difference, that by his own Confeſſion mine may be urged for any Place, but truly I know not for what Place or Subject his was calculated. But if what I ſaid of *Derry* may be applied to any other City in their Circumſtances, I ſee not where the Injury would be to them by it; nor do I very well diſcern how the Bigneſs or Diſtance of the City ſhould add weight to the Argument, tho to tell him truly, I am very glad I had no occaſion to inſtance nearer home, tho I care not how ſoon I may in all the Cities in *Ireland*, provided they conclude as happily. But now was it not very kindly done of our Author, who had ſo little to ſay for his own Tribe, to furniſh the Inhabitants of *Derry* with an Apology in Law, when they did not know what to ſay for themſelves? for his Inſtance in the *Netherlands* is as pat to their purpoſe as if it had been made for them. Altho I think their having ſo many thouſand innocent Perſons among them that muſt certainly have periſhed, if they had not taken up Arms for their Preſervation, was no ill Argument, nor can I believe diſapproved by the Diſſenting Clergy, if they would be once ſo ingenuous and kind as to own their Thoughts in the Point: but I ſuppoſe they might be committed to the Author under the Seal of Confeſſion, and ſo are not to be made publick. For elſe methinks he ſhould not ſo induſtriouſly have avoided the Queſtion, if he had had any thing to have ſaid to it: for I know he has ſo great Kindneſs for the *Perſon of Quality* that he would ſhew him all his Errors and weak Places; therefore I look upon my two Inferences as irrefragable, ſince he dare not undertake their Confutation. For either they did pray for the Deliverance of *London-Derry*, and would have contributed to their Relief; or they would not: If they would, then they are in the ſame Predicament with them, for 'tis with Rebellion as in Murder, there are no Acceſſaries, but all are Principals: A Maxim of our Law, for which ſome poor People in the *Weſt* paid pretty dear after *Monmouth*'s Defeat, as I think the Lady *Liſle*'s Execution will ſufficiently convince any body, who did no more than I believe all our diſſenting Biſhops would have done for them in *London-Derry*, that is, have kept them from ſtarving if they could: but if they would

would not, (I must then repeat what I said before) *It would give me a greater Prejudice against the Doctrine than ever yet I had, since it not only made them put off those Bowels of Mercies which Christians ought to have for one another, but even divested them of Common Humanity.* And whether it would not be a greater Crime to sin against Nature, than to break some nice Bands of our own (not the Laws) imposing in an Oath of Allegiance? I should at another time trust our Author to judg.

And thus, *SIR*, I have in haste run over that part of the Pamphlet, wherein I thought I had any Concern, for I do not pretend to answer for, or justify other People. But if I have not acquitted my self so well as you expected, yet considering my disadvantage of having nothing but my Bible, and a very bad Memory to consult, I hope you will wink at small Faults. I shall not enlarge your Trouble by a needless Apology for the length of this, but conclude with the Complement of the Season, this, and many happy New Years being heartily wish'd You, by

Your most affectionate Friend,

January 9. 1689.

and humble Servant.

FINIS.